

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09296 01 OF 02 120710Z

14

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

TRSE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10

PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15 DRC-01 /153 W

----- 097103

R 110852Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 519

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 9296

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

1. SUMMARY: AD HOC GROUP HEARD REPORTS ON BILATERAL CONTACTS MADE AT RECEPTION GIVEN AUSTRIAN CHANCELLOR NOV. 8, REVIEWED A DRAFT ASSESSMENT OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, AND GAVE CONCEPTUAL REVIEW TO DRAFT US STATEMENT FOR NOV 13 PLENARY BEFORE REFERRING IT TO A DRAFTING GROUP. BILATERALS INDICATED POSSIBILITY, WITH ONE CONTRARY REPORT, THAT FIRST STAGE REDUCTIONS UNDER SOVIET PROPOSAL NEED NOT BE DIVIDED PROPORTIONALLY AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS, AND REVEALED UNCERTAINTY AMONG SOVIET DELEGATES AS TO WHETHER THEIR PROPOSAL WOULD PERMIT REDUCED INDIGENOUS COMBAT EQUIPMENT TO BE ASSIGNED TO RESERVES. PACT DELEGATES ALL MADE EFFORTS TO DRAW WESTERN DELEGATES OUT ON REACTIONS TO THE SOVIET PROPOSAL. OTHER HIGHLIGHTS OF BILATERALS WERE EMPHASIS BY PACT DELEGATES ON DISPARITY IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS (ESPECIALLY NUCLEAR CAPABLE AIRCRAFT) IN CENTRAL EUROPE IN FAVOR OF NATO, INDICATION THAT POLAND HAS ACCURATE FIGURES ON SIZE OF US GROUND FORCES IN THE NGA AND ON SIZE OF FRG FORCES, AND REMARK BY ROMANIAN DELEGATE THAT THE WEST CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09296 01 OF 02 120710Z

MUST HAVE HAD ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL OF NOV. 8 BECAUSE UK REP'S (ROSE) STATEMENT AT THE SAME PLENARY ON DISPARITIES WAS IMMEDIATE AND APPROPRIATE WESTERN REPLY. END SUMMARY.

2. BILATERALS. ITALIAN DEP REP (TALIANI) REPORTED ON A CONVERSATION WITH A ROMANIAN REP (ANINOIU) IN WHICH THE LATTER HAD REPEATED THE USUAL ROMANIAN ARGUMENTS AHT NEUTRALS SHOULD BE INVITED TO ADDRESS THE CONFERENCE AND THAT ALL WORKING GROUPS SHOULD BE OPEN-ENDED. THE ROMANIAN SAID THAT WHILE THE SOVIET NOV. 8 PROPOSAL HAD BEEN APPROVED BY THE RESPECTIVE CENTRAL COMMITTEES IN MOSCOW, BONN, WARSAW, AND PRAGUE, THE ROMANIANS HAD NOT BEEN INFORMED ABOUT IT UNTIL THEY REACHED VIENNA. ONLY ROMANIAN COMMENT ON CONTENT OF SOVIET PROPOSAL WAS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO GIVE IT INTENSIVE STUDY. ROMANIAN OBSERVED THAT ALLIES HAD CERTAINLY SEEN SOVIET PROPOSAL IN ADVANCE, SINCE UK REP'S STATEMENT ON DISPARITIES DURING THE SAME PLENARY WAS CLEARLY AN ANSWER TO IT. ROMANIAN ADDED, IN HIS VIEW, THAT THE FIRST PHASE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL (REDUCTION OF 20,000 BY EACH ALLIANCE) NEED NOT INCLUDE NATIONAL FORCES. ITALIAN DEP REP COMMENTED THAT THIS WOULD ACCOUNT FOR THE COMMENTS OF THE POLISH REP TO THE BELGIAN REP TWO DAYS EARLIER THAT INDICATED THAT A US-SOVIET FIRST PHASE WAS NOT OUT. HOWEVER, CANADIAN ACTING REP (MORGAN) REPORTED THAT SOVIET COL. KAPITONOV HAD TOLD MEMBER OF CANADIAN DEL THAT PHASE ONE REDUCTIONS WOULD HAVE TO INCLUDE FORCES OF ALL PARTICIPANTS.

3. UK REP (ROSE) AND US REP REPORTED ON A CONVERSATION WITH SOVIET DEP REP SMIRNOVSKY. THE LATTER HAD EMPHASIZED THAT WESTERN STATEMENTS WERE DELIBERATELY OMITTING A MAJOR DISPARITY WHICH FAVORED NATO, NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. SMIRNOVSKY HAD ALSO ASKED WHAT THE

ALLIES WOULD DO NEXT, AND WHEN TOLD THAT ALLIES WOULD CONTINUE ELABORATION OF CONCEPTS, HE OBJECTED THAT THERE WAS NO POINT IN LONG DISCUSSION OF ISSUES WHICH COULD NOT BE RESOLVED, AND THAT NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD INSTEAD FOCUS UPON CONCRETE PROPOSALS. UK REP OBSERVED THAT THE NUCLEAR ISSUE WOULD SURELY ARISE AGAIN AND AGAIN, AND UNDERTOOK TO CIRCULATE A PAPER NOV 12 WITH A SUGGESTED ALLIED RESPONSE. US REP SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT FEEL ON THE DEFENSIVE BECAUSE SOVIETS HAD TABLED SPECIFIC PROPOSAL. ALLIES HAD ALREADY MADE PROPOSALS IN THEIR OPENING STATEMENTS, PREDATING SOVIET PROPOSAL. IN FORTHCOMING PLENARY PRESENTATIONS, ALLIES SHOULD CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09296 01 OF 02 120710Z

EMPHASIZE THAT HAVING DESCRIBED ISSUES OF NEGOTIATIONS IN PAST TWO PLENARIES, THEY WERE NOW MAKING GENERAL PROPOSALS (AS DISTINCT FROM DETAILED FORMULATIONS IN TREATY LANGUAGE) ON HOW TO MEET THESE ISSUES. THESE GENERAL PROPOSALS WOULD LEAD UP TO PRESENTATION OF AN ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL OF A MIDDLE LEVEL OF SPECIFICITY, IN LINE

WITH ALLIED POINT IN OPENING STATEMENTS THAT THEY WISHED TO MOVE PROGRESSIVELY FROM GENERAL TO SPECIFID. LATER IN MEETING, US REP INTRODUCED SUGGESTED LANGUAGE FOR NOV 13 PLENARY STATEMENTS TO MAKE THIS POINT.

4. FRG ACTING REP (HOFFMAN) REPORTED ON CONVERSATION WITH POLISH DELEGATE WOJTOWICZ. LATTER HAD SAID THAT THE SOVIET PROPOSAL HAD

PUT THE BALL IN WEST'S COURT. HE COMMENTED THAT IT WAS MUCH HARDER TO START A NEGOTIATION SUCH AS THIS THAN TO FINISH IT UNSUCCESSFULLY, SINCE A FAILURE IN MBFR WOULD SURELY HAVE A MAJOR POLITICAL IMPACT. FRG DEP REP TOOK THIS AS AN IMPLICATION THAT PACT WOULD STAND FIRM ON ITS PROPOSAL AND IN EFFECT DARE THE WEST TO REJECT IT. WOJTOWICZ SCOFFED AT THE DISPARITIES CITED BY NATO, POINTING OUT THAT EVEN IN TERMS OF GROUND FORCE MANPOWER THE FORCE SIZES WERE NOT TOO FAR APART. (HE CITED 193,000 AS THE US FIGURE AND ALSO HAD THE CORRECT FIGURE FOR THE BUNDESWEHR.) WHEN FRG DEP REP MENTIONED THE TANK DISPARITY, WOJTOWICZ ARGUED THAT IT WAS OFFSET BY NATO'S NUCLEAR ARTILLERY. HE ALSO DISCOUNTED THE "DEPTH OF MANEUVER" ARGUMENT, OBSERVING THAT NATO COULD IF NECESSARY RETREAT ALL THE WAY TO PROTUGAL, A POINT WHICH FRG DEP REP REPLIED GAVE HIM LITTLE COMFORT. WOJTOWICZ WENT ON TO SAY THAT POLAND FELT THREATENED BY THE BUNDESWEHR AND BY NATO AIRCRAFT WHICH CARRIED NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WHILE THE US GROUND FORCES IN THE FRG WERE NOT VIEWED AS THREATENING. REDUCTIONS SHOULD DEAL WITH THE MAIN THREAT. FRG DEP REP HAS ASKED ABOUT NAVAL FORCES, AND WHEN WOJTOWICZ OBJECTED THAT THEY WERE COMPLICATED AND HARD TO VERIFY, ASKED HOW AIR FORCES DIFFERED. NO RESPONSE WAS GIVEN. WOJTOWICZ ADDED THAT REDUCTIONS COULD BE VERIFIED BY NATIONAL MEANS. WOJTOWICZ ALSO MAINTAINED THAT MBFR IN ITSELF WOULD BUILD CONFIDENCE, AND WHEN FRG DEP REP ASKED WHY PACT PROPOSAL OMITTED ANY MENTION OF ASSOCIATED MEASURES, HE REPLIED BY ASKING WHAT AREA SUCH MEASURES SHOULD APPLY TO. WOJTOWICZ DESCRIBED THAT PACT AS BEING "IN LIMBO" WITH RESPECT TO THE POINT IN THE WESTERN OPENING STATEMENTS THAT MBFR MUST NOT INTERFERE WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE - WAS THIS POINT MADE AT THE REQUEST OF FRANCE? IN FACT, WITH PART OF THE EC

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09296 01 OF 02 120710Z

IN MBFR AND PART OUT, WOJTOWICZ THOUGHT IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO AVOID AN AGREEMENT THAT HAD SOME BEARING ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EC.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09296 02 OF 02 120614Z

14

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

TRSE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10

PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15 DRC-01 /153 W

----- 096901

R 110852Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 520

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 VIENNA 9296

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

5. BELGIAN ACTING REP REPORTED THAT HE HAD ASKED SOVIET DELEGATE SHUSTOV WHETHER THE SOVIET PROPOSAL WOULD PERMIT REDUCED INDIGENOUS COMBAT EQUIPMENT TO BE USED BY RESERVES, AS ENGLISH TRANSLATION CIRCULATED BY THE SOVIETS HAD INDICATED. SHUSTOV REMARKED THAT A NEW AND BETTER ENGLISH TRANSLATION WAS IN PREPARATION, BUT THAT THE SOVIETS HAD INDEED MEANT TO SAY THAT REDUCED INDIGENOUS COMBAT EQUIPMENT COULD NOT ENTER THE TOE OF "ACTIVE" FORCES. HE WAS THEN CONTRADICTED ON THIS BY ANOTHER SOVIET DELEGATE, AND IN THE END MERELY SAID THAT HE WOULD LET BELGIAN DEP REP KNOW. US DEP REP OBSERVED THAT SOVIET REP KHLESTOV ON NOV 7 HAD BEEN FAIRLY EXPLICIT THAT REDUCED INDIGENOUS COMBAT EQUIPMENT SHOULD EITHER BE DESTROYED OR, IN THE CASE OF ITEMS LIKE TRUCKS, CONVERTED TO CIVILIAN USE. FRG ACTING REP NOTED THAT WOJTOWICZ HAD SAID THAT THE TEN PERCENT

REDUCTION IN THE THIRD PHASE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL WOULD BE TEN PERCENT OF THE FORCES AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS PHASE, ALTHOUGH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09296 02 OF 02 120614Z

KHLESTOV HAD TOLD US REP NOV 7 THAT THE REDUCTION WOULD BE 10 PERCENT OF FORCE LEVELS ON DAY TREATY WAS SIGNED.

6. ASSESSMENT PAPER. THE GROUP REVIEWED A PAPER ENTITLED "PRE-LIMINARY ANALYSIS OF WP REDUCTION PROPOSAL OF 8 NOVEMBER," (TEXT SEPTTEL) WHICH A DRAFTING SUBGROUP HAD PREPARED ON THE BASIS OF THE PREVIOUS DAY'S DISCUSSION. A NUMBER OF CHANGES WERE SUGGESTED, AND THE DRAFTING GROUP WAS INSTRUCTED TO PREPARE A REVISION, WITH THE IDEA THAT AN AGREED AD HOC GROUP ASSESSMENT WOULD BE OF VALUE TO CAPITALS. THE MAIN CONCEPTUAL POINT MADE IN THE DISCUSSION WAS THAT ALTHOUGH THE SOVIET PROPOSAL IS OSTENSIBLY FRAMED IN TERMS OF PHASES, THE PROPOSAL ENVISAGES A SINGLE AGREEMENT IN WHICH THE PHASES WOULD APPLY ONLY TO IMPLEMENTATION, RATHER THAN TO NEGOTIATIONS AS IN THE ALLIED APPROACH. THE SOVIET APPROACH TO PHASING IS THUS A POINT OF DIVERGENCE FROM THE ALLIED APPROACH RATHER THAN A POSSIBLE POINT OF COMMON GROUND. US DEP REP SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES ADOPT TERMINOLOGY OF A POSSIBLE AGREEMENT AS "STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION" RESERVING THE WORD "PHASE" FOR SEPARATE PHASES OF NEGOTIATION.

7. US STATEMENT. US DRAFT THEME ON PHASING AND US-SOVIET REDUCTIONS FOR NOV 13 PLENARY WAS GIVEN A "CONCEPTUAL REVIEW" ON UNDERSTANDING THAT THE DRAFTING SUBGROUP WOULD GO OVER IT IN DETAIL IN THE LIGHT

OF THESE GENERAL COMMENTS. US REP CURCULATED A REVISION OF THE
OPENING OF THE STATEMENT, DESIGNED TO HIGHLIGHT THE FACT THAT
ALLIES WERE MVING FROM DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE TOWARDS GENERAL
PROPOSALS. GROUP UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED CONCEPT, AND ALSO AGREED THAT
OPENING PART OF FRG STATEMENT FOR NOV 13 PLENARY SHOULD BE CHANGED
TO REFLECT IT. TEXTS OF FRG STATEMENT AND US STATE-
MENT WILL BE SENT IN SEPTELS.

8. GROUP WILL MEET AT 3:15 P.M. ON NOV 12 IN US DELEGATION
CONFERENCE ROOM. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 12 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, MEETING DELEGATIONS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 11 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: mcintyresh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA09296
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: DG ALTERED
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731168/abqcelne.tel
Line Count: 229
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: mcintyresh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <13-Jul-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <20-Aug-2001 by mcintyresh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: n/a
TAGS: PARM, US, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO NATO
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005